



Law Offices of  
**KARLA SHIPPEY**

**MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.**

July 28, 2004

Page 4 of 6 Page(s)

## Section 2. Amendments to the Specification

### In the Specification, Page 7:

5

200 50 is narrowed to approximately one half of an inch to match the width of the belt clip portion 30 shown in Figure 6. The handle portion 70 also acts to push out and clear any remaining shell casings that may have been left in the gun thereby eliminating gun jams. Handle portion 70 includes a plurality of raised ribs 4 to help improve the user's grip on the feeder of the present invention 100. The smaller diameter ends 10,20 of the head 70 50 allow the front portion of a standard ammunition belt to snap onto the ends 10, 20 and allow the top surface 127 of the front of the belt clip to be on the same plain with the central portion 30 of the head as shown in Figure 5. The feeder 100 of the present invention is constructed of molded plastic such as sac which has a high melt point and is recognized by the military as being acceptable for this application. The handle portion 70 is hard yet somewhat flexible in nature and has a high resistance resulting from lateral stresses that may occur during operation. The head 50 shape can be modified to accommodate a variety of caliber of bullet including any 7.62 mm ammunition belt as well as 5.56 mm and 50 caliber belted ammunition. The handle portion 70 is designed to fit into any standard NATO linked ammunition. The present invention requires no changes to the machine gun or the ammunition belt. The present invention can make the belt loading Process up to ten times faster than traditional loading techniques. Additionally, because the present invention 100 allows the user to reload a machine gun without lifting the feed tray cover, the aiming apparatus located on top of the feed tray cover remains in place and does not have to be recalibrated. The resulting time saved during the reloading process is vital when in a combat situation where machine guns are brought to bear.

25



Law Offices of  
**KARLA SHIPPEY**

**MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.**

July 28, 2004

Page 5 of 6 Page(s)

### Section 3. Reply to the Office re §112 objections

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of §112 objections raised in the Office Action, based on the amendments to the claims in section 1 above, and in consideration of the  
5 observations below. The claims were modified to address Examiner's concerns. These specific notes are addressed to the modifications made therein.

The terminology 'M60 machine gun' and '240 Golf machine gun' refer to US Army standard issue weapons with which the present invention is designed to operate. Virtually any soldier in  
10 the US Army and Marine infantry will be familiar with this terminology. To clarify the claims, these terms were replaced with 'US Army standard issue', which should be less ambiguous.

The terminology '7.62 m ammunition belt' refers again to Army standard issue belted ammunition for the above machine guns. It is referred to in the specification as 'standard NATO  
15 linked ammunition', which is another term for the same item. This has been standard issue in the US Army for approximately 50 years. Again, every soldier will be familiar with this terminology. Although Examiner is correct that there are other types of 7.62 mm belted ammunition (for instance, Russian manufacture), the present invention can be adapted to work with all of them. As a practical matter, the US Army standard issue 7.62 mm belted ammunition  
20 will be the preferred ammunition for the feed device of the current invention. The standard issue 7.62 mm belted ammunition is described in Dept. of Defense military specifications MIL-C-46277 and MIL-C-46931, and perhaps others.

In regards to the ammunition found in claim 4, the 5.56 mm ammunition is standard issue for  
25 rifles (the M-16) and light machine guns (the M-249 SAW), and has been standard issue since the introduction of the M-16 rifle during the Vietnam War. The 50-caliber belted ammo is standard issue for the M-2 machine gun, and has been present in US Army stocks since WW II.

The term 'feed pawl' in claim 1 is well known in the art as an element of any machine gun, as is  
30 the 'feed tray' of Claim 6. Claim 1 is cast to describe a feeding device for any machine gun, while later dependent claims (see claim 2) are more limiting.

Prepared by Michael A. Shippey - Law Offices of Karla Shippey - 1-800-693-9110

5